For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason for combining Alexandre and Loomis because Loomis is directed to non-analogous art. In particular, Loomis discloses a ballistic injector (see Loomis, Abstract). Such injectors are designed to generate a shockwave for injecting solid particles. In contrast, Alexandre discloses a needless syringe (see Alexandre, Abstract). Needless syringes use mechanical force to inject a liquid.

The mechanism and use of a ballistic injector is very different from the mechanism and use of a needless syringe. For example, the expulsion mechanism of a ballistic injector involves the build up of pressure within a high-pressure chamber. The high pressure generates a force, which expels the solid particles. In contrast, the expulsion mechanism of a needless syringe involves a mechanical plunger or plunger-like device. The plunger or plunger-like device itself directly expels the liquid.

Thus, Loomis fails to remedy the deficiency of Alexandre because one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine Alexandre with Loomis, which is directed to non-analogous art. Furthermore, even if Alexandre and Loomis were combined, they would still fail to disclose each and every feature recited in claim 1.

For example, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, the coupler 64 of Loomis does not correspond to the bore recited in claim 1. The coupler 64 of Loomis is located upstream of membrane 92, which supports the micro particles to be injected (see Loomis, Figs. 1 and 5 and col. 4, lines 43-49). Accordingly, coupler 64 of Loomis is not configured to receive the particles being injected. However, claim 1 recites "a receptacle...with at least one peripheral injection conduit...the internal volume of said bore permits clearance of the inlets of the peripheral conduits when the downstream obturator is lodged in the bore." In other words, when the downstream obturator of claim 1 is lodged in the bore of claim 1, the liquid contained by the downstream obtuator enters the inlets of the peripheral conduits via the bore. Thus, the bore of claim 1 is configured to receive the liquid being injected. Therefore,

Loomis would still fail to remedy the deficiency of Alexandre, and claim 1 is patentable over Alexandre and Loomis.

Claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, those claims are also patentable over Alexandre and Loomis at lest for their dependencies from claim 1 as well as for the additional features those claims recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Brian K. Kauffman
Registration No. 63,199

WPB:BKK/jls

Date: December 22, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461